UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/518,620	01/20/2006	David Labonte	WEAT/0640	9031	
	7590 07/13/200 & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.	EXAMINER			
3040 POST OA	K BOULEVARD, SU	OMGBA, ESSAMA			
HOUSTON, TX	X //030		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3726			
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			07/13/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summany		Application No.		Applicant(s)					
		10/518,620	)	LABONTE ET AL.					
Office Action Summary			Examiner		Art Unit				
			Essama On		3726				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commur or Reply	nication appe	ears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	ldress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any r	CRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE INSIDE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE INSIDE STATE IN THE STATE OF THE STAT	MAILING DA s of 37 CFR 1.136 munication. tatutory period wi y will, by statute, o	TE OF THI 6(a). In no even ill apply and will cause the applic	S COMMUNICATION t, however, may a reply be tin expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ation to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status									
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>03 Ap</i>	ril 2009						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	. · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·								
3)	Since this application is in condition	′—			secution as to the	e merits is			
- ,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims								
4)🛛	Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the	application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)🖂	S)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.								
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restri	ction and/or	election red	quirement.					
Applicati	on Papers								
9)□	The specification is objected to by th	ne Examiner							
-	The drawing(s) filed on is/are			objected to by the I	Examiner.				
•	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	g the correction	on is required	d if the drawing(s) is ob	ected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>									
2)  Notic 3) Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (I nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date			4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate				

Application/Control Number: 10/518,620 Page 2

Art Unit: 3726

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 2. Claims 1-8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Karaev et al. (US Patent 5,088,638) and Current (US Patent 3,489,620).

With regards to claim 1, Applicant, at pages 1-3 of the specification to be known as AAPA, discloses a method of manufacturing a continuous sucker rod coil, the method comprising fusing together a number of raw coils end-to-end to form one continuous sucker rod of a desired length, the ends being fused together by welding which creates heat-affected zones adjacent to the welded area, treating the entire length of the continuous sucker rod to produce a rod of consistent hardness and strength, and coiling the continuous rod. AAPA does not disclose using coils having the same uniform hardness to form the continuous rod and treating only the heat-affected zones. However Current teaches heat-treating individual rod bodies prior to connecting the rod bodies end-to-end (col. 1, lines 21-27 and col. 2, lines 24-27). Further, Karaev et al. teaches using pre-hardened rod bodies having free ends to form a continuous sucker rod by fusing together the pre-hardened rod bodies (col. 3, lines 19-24 and 32-38), the fusing creating fused areas and a heat-affected area at each fused area (col. 4, lines 48-61), and treating each of the heat affected area to alleviate irregularities induced during fusing (col. 5, lines 46-50). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have substituted the raw coils of AAPA with the pre-hardened rod bodies of Current or Karaev et al., and to have treated only the heat-affected zones as taught by Karaev et al., in order to simplify the manufacturing process of the continuous sucker rod and save on production costs.

Applicant should note that it is inherent that the sucker rods of Current and Karaev et al. will be pre-hardened so as to have the same hardness

Regarding claim 2, see column 2, lines 27-28 of Current.

Regarding claims 3-8, see column 1, lines 49-54 and column 2, lines 58-65 of Current. Applicant should note that shot-peening before or after the fusing is an obvious matter of design choice.

Regarding claim 20, see column 2, line 24-27 of Current.

3. Claims 9-14, 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA, in view of Current, Karaev et al. and Nast et al. (US Patent 3,210,838).

With regards to claims 9-14, Applicant, at pages 1-3 of the specification to be known as AAPA, discloses a method of manufacturing a continuous sucker rod coil, the method comprising fusing together a number of raw coils end-to-end to form one continuous sucker rod of a desired length, the ends being fused together by welding which creates heat-affected zones adjacent to the welded area, treating the entire length of the continuous sucker rod to produce a rod of consistent hardness and strength, and coiling the continuous rod. AAPA does not disclose using coils having the

Application/Control Number: 10/518,620

Page 4 Art Unit: 3726 same uniform hardness to form the continuous rod and treating only the heat-affected zones. However Current teaches heat-treating individual rod bodies prior to connecting the rod bodies end-to-end (col. 1, lines 21-27 and col. 2, lines 24-27). Further, Karaev et al. teaches using pre-hardened rod bodies having free ends to form a continuous sucker rod by fusing together the pre-hardened rod bodies (col. 3, lines 19-24 and 32-38), the fusing creating fused areas and a heat-affected area at each fused area (col. 4, lines 48-61), and treating each of the heat affected area to alleviate irregularities induced during fusing (col. 5, lines 46-50). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have substituted the raw coils of AAPA with the pre-hardened rod bodies of Current or Karaev et al., and to have treated only the heat-affected zones as taught by Karaev et al., in order to simplify the manufacturing process of the continuous sucker rod and save on production costs. Although AAPA/Current/Karaev et al. does not disclose inspecting the coil for flaws, however, it is known to inspect wire stock for flaws, removing the detected flaws to create free ends of the wire stock and fusing the free ends to create a continuous wires stock as attested by Nast et al., see column 2, lines 28-46 and 57-72. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have inspected the rolled stock of AAPA/Current/Karaev et al., for flaws, to have removed the detected flaws and to have fused the ends created by the removing of the defects, in light of the teachings of Nast et al., in order to obtain a rolled continuous rolled stock that is essentially free of defects. Applicant should note that marking the areas for flaws or reversing the rod to place the marked flaws at the beginning of the

fusing step are obvious matter of design choice. Applicant should also note that it is inherent that the rolled stock for sucker rods will be pre-hardened so as to have the same hardness.

Regarding claim 18, see column 1, lines 49-54 and column 2, lines 58-65 of Current.

Regarding claim 21, see column 2, line 24-27 of Current.

4. Claims 15-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA/Current/Karaev et al./Nast et al. as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Payne.

With regards to claims 15-17, AAPA/Current/Karaev et al./Nast et al. discloses a method of manufacturing a continuous sucker rod coil as shown above. Although AAPA/Current/Karaev et al./Nast et al. does not disclose visual and eddy-current flaw detections, however it is known to use visual and eddy-current flaw detections in inspecting sucker rods as attested by Payne, see column 3, lines 3-10. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have used visual and eddy-current inspection in the method of AAPA/Current/Karaev et al./Nast et al., in light of the teachings of Payne, as is known in the art.

Regarding claim 19, see column 1, lines 66-68 and column 2, lines 1-5 of Payne.

Application/Control Number: 10/518,620 Page 6

Art Unit: 3726

## Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Essama Omgba whose telephone number is (571) 272-4532. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-6:30, 1st Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bryant can be reached on (571) 272-4526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/518,620 Page 7

Art Unit: 3726

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Essama Omgba/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3726

eo July 10, 2009